

Chen 2000-0373

Remarks

Reconsideration of remaining claims 1-3 and 5-19 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated April 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected all claims 1-19 under 35 USC §§ 112, second paragraph, 102(e) and 103(a). The Examiner's various rejections will be discussed below in the order appearing in the Office action.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph Rejection - Claims 1-14

The Examiner first rejected claims 1-14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, the Examiner cited as unclear the phrase "in response to a teleconference set-up command received at said teleconference platform" as it appears in independent claim 1. The Examiner stated that "[i]t cannot be seen how a platform can receive a command". In response, applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4, defining the inclusion of a network-controlling server at the teleconference platform, with the "commands" being received (and then processed) by the server. With this amendment, it is believed that the Examiner's rejection has been fully overcome.

35 USC § 102(e) Rejection - Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15 and 19

The Examiner further rejected the above-cited claims under 35 USC 102(a) as being "anticipated" by US Patent 6,816,468 (Cruickshank). In particular, the Examiner cited Cruickshank as teaching "a teleconferencing system allowing data communication with a data network...including a computer/telephony system in communication with a voice and a data network", thus anticipating the subject matter of the cited claims.

In response, applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15 to more clearly define the subject matter of the present invention as being directed to the situation where an individual desires to set up a conference call, but lacks the capability to do so through the telephone he has connected to the conventional voice communication

Chen 2000-0373

network. In this case, the data network is used by the individual to initiate the teleconference set-up by sending a "data" command that is subsequently "translated" by the network-controlling server into "telecommunications commands". The translation performed by Cruickshank is translating a voice call in a first language into a second language. The use of both the voice and data networks by Cruickshank allows for the translation to occur. There is no discussion or suggestion in Cruickshank that his service would allow for an individual at a telephone with conferencing capabilities to set up a conference call, which is the subject matter of the present invention, as clearly defined by the amended claims.

In light of this discussion, as well as the above-cited amendments to the claims, applicants assert that Cruickshank cannot be found to "anticipate" the subject matter of the present invention. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15 and 19 to be in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 3, 6-14 and 16-18

The Examiner next rejected claims 3, 6-14 and 16-18 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cruickshank (as above) in further view of US Patent 6,417,933 (Szurkowski). The Szurkowski reference was cited by the Examiner as teaching the use of an administrative processor to assist in conference call scheduling. Regardless of the teaching of Szurkowski, applicants assert that the combination of Cruickshank and Szurkowski still does not disclose or suggest an arrangement or method of providing conference call set-up from a "communications device" that is incapable of performing conference calling via the traditional voice network. The present invention, by virtue of utilizing a data network with the voice network, provides such capability, as well as the additional "features", as defined in the above-cited rejected claims, regarding the use of database technology to provide calling lists, scheduling processes, and the like.

Applicants thus believe that with the above-cited amendments to independent claims 1 and 15, dependent claims 3, 6-14 and 16-18 should be considered as allowable over the cited combination of references. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

Chen 2000-0373

In summary, the present application contains claims 1-3 and 5-19, where independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more specifically define the subject matter of the present invention and provide a sufficient basis of distinction between this subject matter and the cited references. With these amendments, applicants believe that the case is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable response from the Examiner in that regard. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not agree that the case is ready to issue, and that an interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yihsiu Chen et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba
Wendy W. Koba
Reg. No. 30509
Attorney for applicants
610-346-7112

Date: 7/18/05